

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 17-18, 20, 21, 27, 30-33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43, and 69-are currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 13, 20, 30 and 41 have been amended in this paper.

Claims 2-4, 14-16, 19, 22-26, 28-29, 34, 36-37, 40, 42 and 44-46 have been previously cancelled.

Claim 67 is canceled in this paper.

Claims 7-11 were previously withdrawn.

Claims 68- is newly presented.

Examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112

Claims 5, 6, 13, 20, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are rejected for the use of improper use of alternative expressions. This rejection is moot in view of the amendments to the subject claims which are believed to correct the improper usage.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Claims 41 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Adamovics because the provisional application fails to provide support for the aspect ratio range “of less than 20:1” as recited in these claims. This rejection is moot in view of the amendment to claim 41 to remove the term and in the cancellation of claim 67.

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested..

Claims 1, 5, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 30, 33, and 38 are rejected under 35 U. S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parthenopoulos et al. The basis of the rejection is that Parthenopoulos discloses 100 micron films which are deemed to read on “thick” of the instant claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a thickness of greater than 100 microns, making this rejection moot. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 17-18, 20, 21, 33, 38, 41, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moscovitch. The basis of the rejection is that Moscovitch teaches a 3-D ORAM comprising a volume of transparent polymer doped with a light sensitive chemical, equipped with an electronic dosimeter for providing real time monitoring of radiation exposure based on use of an optical memory element.

This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to claim 1 and the discussion below.

Moscovitch discloses a device wherein information concerning radiation is stored in an optical memory element as a function of neutron radiation to which the optical memory element is exposed, and then the altered information from the optical memory element is retrieved for subsequent analysis. This is a two-step process which requires two beams of radiation. In contrast, the instant invention requires only one beam of radiation. This limitation has been inserted into claims 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 12, 13, 27, 30-32, 35, 39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Moscovitch in view of Kim et al or Robillard or Pate et al. Since the added references do not overcome the deficiencies of Moscovitch as discussed above, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Entry of this amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Show the Examiner believe that a telephone call to the undersigned would narrow

any outstanding issues or favorably advance the prosecution of this application, she is respectfully invited to call at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Barbara V Maurer". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and address.

Barbara V Maurer  
5 Haven Hill Rise  
Flemington, NJ 08822

908-303-5635